

52826
Box 1

664

OSTRACISM OF ROMAN CATHOLICS

The Legislation and Administration of Public Affairs,
1872 to 1894.

THE FINANCES

McGILL UNIVERSITY LIBRARY

SPEECH OF SIR OLIVER MOWAT

—AT—

KINGSTON,

19TH JANUARY, 1895.

Respecting candidature of Hon. William Harty.

I thank you for the kind manner in which you have received me. I specially appreciate it as coming from a large and representative gathering of the men and women of Kingston, my native place, the home of my childhood and youth and early manhood, the home still of near and dear relatives and of esteemed friends, the home formerly and the resting place now of my honored father and mother and of a dear brother, who have all gone to the other world before me. There is much to attach me to old Kingston. I like to visit whatever in and around it is least changed, and therefore serves to remind me most of the days of my boyhood and youth; but I also rejoice greatly at the progress which Kingston has made since those days. I like to contrast its condition in my early days, when its population was some 5,000, and its condition now, when its population is nearly 20,000, with improved streets and roads, railways connecting the city with the whole continent in various directions, and an electric street railway for the convenience of its own people when moving about at home. And it has many other advantages now which it had not in my early days—gas lamps and electric lights, steam ferries, great school buildings, grand churches, noble public buildings, and many other marks of wealth, prosperity and progress. I am glad that amongst the schools of Kingston there has recently been established a school of Mining and Dairying, and I am glad that I had something to do with making practicable the establishing of such a school here for eastern Ontario. The Legislature had provided at a still earlier date for a school of Mining at Port Arthur for the west, but that school, I am sorry to say, has not yet gone any further. It was but a year or so before I left Kingston that

Queen's College went into operation, and Kingston became a University town. It has now held that position for half a century and more; and the University has during that time made more progress than Kingston has done in perhaps any other respect. The University has accomplished a grand work so far, and I have no doubt is destined for still greater things. Its sons are in every part of the province; and by the positions they occupy they testify to the value of their alma mater; for they are filling most creditably places in Parliament, in the Local Legislature, in the Church, in the Army, and in every other profession and worldly calling for which mental culture is necessary or important. Kingston is unsurpassed in attractions for residence, and has natural advantages which secure for it permanent progress. Its progress may sometimes have been slower than some of its people and friends would desire, but its progress has always been sure, and its future is promising.

Apart from any particular views on political subjects, it is interesting for a native of Kingston to remember that it was from Kingston that the Conservatives of Canada took their leader in Canadian politics, Sir John Macdonald. It was from Kingston too, that Conservatives chose for many years their leader in the Canadian Legislative Council and afterwards in the Canadian Senate under Sir John Macdonald. It was in Kingston they found one of their best Speakers of the Dominion House of Commons. It was from Kingston that His Excellency the Governor-General in Council chose two of the Lieutenant-Governors of Ontario. And it is from Kingston rather than from some other place that, as Premier of Ontario, I now want my Commissioner of Public Works for the next four years. His Honor the Lieutenant-Governor has appointed Mr. Harty to this office, but his appointment is subject to ratification by the electors of Kingston, and it is for you now to ratify it. I want his help in giving to the province the best Government practicable.

A voice—You'll get him. (Cheers.)

I am glad of that assurance. You could not do better. I want him because of the high character he has always borne in all the affairs of life. The best guarantee a people can have for the fidelity of a representative in the Legislature or the Government is the uprightness of his transactions in private life. I want Mr. Harty as Commissioner of Public Works because also of his business experience and proved ability. The department of Public Works is an important one, and as it has always (like every other department of the Provincial Government) been free from boodling heretofore, so I know that under Mr. Harty it will continue to be free from boodling in the future. It is not only that Mr. Harty is too honest a man and too self-respecting to be a boodler himself, but he is also too alert and wide-awake a man, and too resolute in character and habits, to admit of others boodling in any matters under his control. Dr. Smythe, his opponent, is a very respectable man, and I am glad to know this from Mr. Harty himself as well as from others; but Kingston with Dr. Smythe as its member, respectable as he is, would occupy a far less important place in the estimation of the people of the province and outside of the province, than Kingston will with Mr. Harty as its member and at the same time Minister of Public Works and a member of the Government of the province.

I am told that in the canvass which has taken place so far it has been found that the only thing which appears to weigh with anyone against Mr. Harty is that he is a Roman Catholic. I do not hear that Dr. Smythe

himself urges this against him, but those who canvass for Dr. Smythe or otherwise endeavor to influence Protestant voters in his favor, are said to urge nothing else than the iniquity of voting for a Papist; and Dr. Smythe does not repudiate their tactics, though they are too indefensible for himself to take part in.

Now why should Mr. Harty's having been brought up a Roman Catholic, and being a Roman Catholic, stand in his way with any Protestant? Roman Catholics have always been voting and working for Protestant candidates in Kingston both Liberal and Conservative. Is it much that a Roman Catholic resident of the city, who is personally esteemed and respected amongst you, should in turn be elected by Protestants notwithstanding his being a Roman Catholic? Protestant as Kingston has always been, it was once represented by a Roman Catholic before Mr. Harty. I mean the late Anthony Manahan, who represented Kingston in the first Parliament after the Union of Upper and Lower Canada; and Protestants got no harm from his Romanism. After the lapse of half a century may not Protestants unite in thinking it is time to give a Roman Catholic a turn? Is any Conservative Protestant in Kingston objecting to this, and giving the fact of Mr. Harty being a Roman Catholic as a reason for voting against him? A Kingston Conservative ought to be the last to use such an argument. Many Roman Catholics in Kingston always worked and voted for the great Conservative chief. Sir John Macdonald was always in alliance too with the Roman Catholics of Quebec, and had at one time, and perhaps had always, the support of the great majority of the Roman Catholics of Ontario; and but for the support of Roman Catholics he would not have been able to hold office for a day of his long official life. He was not only supported by Roman Catholics, but he was always associated with Roman Catholics in the Government, and even held office under Roman Catholic premiers. He served for years under Mr. Cartier (afterwards Sir George Cartier); then under another Roman Catholic, Sir Etienne Tache; and then under still another, Sir Narcisse Belleau. So, the first premier that he himself chose for Ontario was a Roman Catholic, Mr. J. Sandfield Macdonald; and whatever that gentleman's faults may have been, any undue leaning to his religionists was not one of them. Again, all Canada is at this day mourning the death of another premier who was a Roman Catholic, Sir John Thompson. This Roman Catholic gentleman was practically chosen for premier by the Conservatives of the Parliament of Canada, and he was one of the best Conservative premiers that ever held office. In view of such facts as these, no Conservative in Kingston can honestly use the religious objection against one of the best Roman Catholics in Kingston, now chosen to share in the Government of the province, subject to the ratification of the electors of Kingston.

As regards Mr. Harty, it is satisfactory to know that the most sensitive or excitable Protestant has no fault to find with him personally. He is esteemed and respected by you all. He has mingled all his life with Protestants, in business, in society, in politics, and in every public movement. An earnest Roman Catholic, attached and faithful to his church, he has never made himself offensive on that account to those of a different religious faith from his own. He has shown himself, in his intercourse with others and in all the relations of life, to be a broad-minded, independent man, and has always had the esteem, respect and confidence of the Protestants as well as Roman Catholics of Kingston. He is in a word the last man against whom the "No Popery" cry should be raised here, except as it may be raised against every

or any one of that faith. A cry against all Roman Catholics as such is, beyond all doubt, against the best interests of our country.

I know that an organization exists in the province which avows as its purpose to exclude Roman Catholics from all offices in the gift of the people, and to shut them out as far as possible from all private employment as well. This organization had a branch and emissaries here at the time of the general election, and had much to do with depriving Mr. Harty of the majority he had in 1892, and of defeating him for the time by a majority of one at the general election. The membership of this organization and its influence have in most western parts of the province greatly diminished since. I hope that the polling on the 28th will show that religious rancor has had its day here too, and has now passed away; that Roman Catholics are not to be ostracized in the loyal city of Kingston; and that a Roman Catholic candidate will be treated by every elector according to his merits and his qualifications, as a Protestant is.

The ostracism of Roman Catholics is not a way by which Protestants can hope to make them Protestants. As to this, a Protestant religious journal in a recent number had this to say: "There is only one effectual way by which the Roman Catholics of Quebec and of every other country can be shown that Protestantism is a much better system of religion than theirs. Let the lives of Protestants be purer, more useful, and more consecrated than the lives of Roman Catholics, and then the Catholics can see the superiority for themselves. If a man defends Protestantism with his tongue, and libels it with his life, he need never expect to commend it to anybody." All thoughtful Protestants must concur in these observations of the reverend editor.

Most Roman Catholics are Roman Catholics by reason of their education and surroundings; and most Protestants are Protestants for like reasons. I believe with my fellow Protestants that in regard to the differences between us and Roman Catholics, the truth is with us. But I do not forget that Roman Catholics are not necessarily bad men, or bad citizens, or ignorant persons, as some well-meaning Protestant zealots allow themselves to believe. While as a Protestant, I, in common with other Protestants, regard as indefensible many dogmas of the Roman Catholic church, and many of its doings too as recorded in the histories which we accept, I cannot and do not shut my eyes to the historical fact, strange and unaccountable as it may seem to us, that the Roman Catholic faith has been held and defended by men distinguished for virtue and learning and genius; by such men in the past as More, Fenelon, Bossuet, Newman, Manning and many others, whose memories all good Protestants who know anything about them respect, or more than respect.

I should not forget either, that Protestants and Roman Catholics hold some important religious opinions in common. We do not differ about everything. The best theologians of both creeds admit and assert this. I say of both creeds. For example: Hear first what the Roman Catholic Archbishop Ryan late'y said to his people as to articles of faith which are common to Roman Catholics and Protestants: "How much have we not in common? Belief in God and His providence, belief in future rewards and punishments, and, above all—belief and hope and love in the great unitive power of the world—Jesus Christ. Around His standard let us gather who love Him." Let us remember the incident related in the ninth chapter of St. Luke's Gospel, when the Apostle St. John said to our Lord, 'That there was a man who was casting our devils in

Thy name, and we forbade him, because he followeth not with us.' And Jesus said: 'Forbid him not, for he that is not against you is with you.' In another place He said: 'He that is not with Me is against Me.' But the man that casts out devils in Christ's name was evidently not against Christ, though he did not associate with His followers."

Then from a Protestant standpoint, the learned and respected principal of Knox College, a Protestant of Protestants, speaking to an assembly of approving Equal Righters, pointed out in like manner that "there is a great deal of truth held in common by Protestants and Roman Catholics;" that "both Protestants and Roman Catholics believe in the moral law; and in saying that the Saviour became incarnate and died for us, and in the Holy Spirit, our Teacher, Sanctifier and Comforter, and in a future state of rewards." He added: "The whole range of life and the dogmas which rule life are common to the whole Christian world." So, your own Queen's University, whose managers and professors are intensely Protestant, recognized the value of the truths held by Protestants and Roman Catholics in common by selecting some two years ago a Scottish Catholic Priest, the late venerable and venerated Dr. Dawson, to preach the baccalaureate sermon before the University. In the like spirit, the Manitoba and North West Conference of the Methodist church, at a recent meeting in Winnipeg, passed a resolution of "fraternal sympathy" (as it is called in the official minutes) with the Roman Catholics of that territory on the occasion of the death of their Archbishop. This is the resolution: "Resolved, that as a Conference we express our profound sympathy with that portion of our citizenship now made to mourn because of the death of Archbishop Tache, which took place yesterday. A just man, and whose name and life-work are closely connected with the history and development of Manitoba and the North West, has been taken away from our midst. And under the influence of our common Christianity we mourn with those who mourn." Much more to the same effect might be cited; and I hope that the learned Archbishop whom I named a moment ago was right when he recently said: "With regard to differences among Christians, I do not believe that any enlightened members of any Protestant denomination maintain that the members of other denominations or the members of the Catholic church shall be excluded from salvation simply because they belong to such organizations. I am quite certain that the Catholic church does not exclude Jews, Gentiles or Protestants from salvation. She leaves such judgment to Almighty God, who alone knows each individual soul and can alone judge of its merits and demerits."

In our province of Ontario, Roman Catholics constitute about one-sixth of the population, and they contribute their share to the productions, the wealth and the prosperity of the province. They numbered by the last census 358,300. Let those who would ostracize them consider their importance to the province by reason even of their number alone. It may bring this fact home to some if they would try to realize in their own minds what the effect would be if 358,300 of the population of the province should leave to-morrow for other lands. The loss would, beyond all doubt, be the greatest blow to the well-being of the rest that the province has ever received.

One consideration more. Let us remember that the Roman Catholics of the British Empire have always constituted an important part of Britain's armies. In every war they have fought side by side with Protestant soldiers, in the cause of their common country. To every battle won by British arms, and to every conquest made under the British flag, Roman Catholics have contributed their full share all the world over. They have shed their

blood in their country's cause quite as freely as their Protestant comrades shed theirs. It has been so in Canada as well as elsewhere. Roman Catholics were with the Protestants of Canada in the time of the American revolution. They were with them in the war of 1812. They were with them in the outbreak of 1837. They were with them in resisting the Fenian raid in 1866, and in putting down the revolt of the half-breeds in the North West in 1885. They have been our brothers in arms. Let every Protestant treat them as brothers in peace. (Cheers.)

Some good people seem to be in a very fright at the idea of a Roman Catholic being elected to the Provincial Legislature. I should be sorry to think Protestantism so weak a thing as their notion supposes. Their notion is a mistake. Protestantism is not so weak a thing. It is not weak at all. Protestantism is strong. As a Protestant I believe, and all vigorous Protestants should believe, that in an equal fight Protestantism can and will hold its own as against every hostile influence, be it what it may. But the fight which these people fear would not be an equal fight, for what is the position of a Roman Catholic in the Government of Ontario? He is one of eight members. The Government consists of seven Protestants who have been elected, and of one Roman Catholic who is now seeking election at your hands. Has any Protestant elector in Kingston so poor an opinion of Protestantism and Protestants that he thinks seven Protestants cannot hold their own against one Roman Catholic? Then take the position of Mr. Harty as a member of the House of Assembly. What could one man do in a House of ninety-four members? I believe five Roman Catholics only were returned at the last general election. When Mr. Harty and Mr. Conmee are elected, there will be but seven Roman Catholics in the House—seven Roman Catholics to eighty-seven Protestants. Is it possible that any Protestant supposes that the Protestants of Ontario cannot afford to have seven Roman Catholics in a House of ninety-four members? That one Roman Catholic is equal, or more than equal to thirteen Protestants? And that for the safety of Protestantism the number of Roman Catholic members must be kept down to five? The P.P.A.s. think that their entire exclusion from place and power and employment is the only safety for Protestantism, but it is hardly possible to imagine that any intelligent Protestant outside of that organization has any such absurd notion. I think we can stand Mr. Harty in the House and in the Government. I shall not be afraid of him. (Laughter.)

Do any in Kingston say, that while the fact of Mr. Harty's being a Roman Catholic is not against him, yet that he should be opposed by Protestants because the Government of which he is now a member has been too favorable to Roman Catholics in the matter of Patronage, or of grants to Hospitals and Charities, or in the matter of Separate School legislation? This charge has been made against us, but there is not the slightest ground for it; and it is really easy to show this to the satisfaction of every intelligent man who wants to know the truth. I can only now speak briefly on the subject. As for Patronage, we had some months ago an official enquiry made of the facts; and the report thereon has been published. Anyone might have shown errors in this report if errors were to be found; but not one error has been shown. What did this report prove? It proved that the number of Roman Catholics in public employment is less than their proportion of the population, and that the aggregate of their salaries also is less than the proportion of Roman Catholics in the population. In other words, the report shows it to be perfectly certain that Roman Catholics have not had an

excessive share of the patronage in the gift of the Ontario Government. Those who have thought otherwise have beyond all question been under a mistake. If anyone still says otherwise he must either be a deceiver or be himself deceived. Then as to Hospitals and Charities. The principle on which grants to these are regulated was adopted twenty years ago with general approval, and embodied in a statute passed in 1874, and acted on ever since. The principle is, that the amount of the grant to each should be according to the work done and the amount contributed from other sources, in the case of every institution aided, irrespective of the religious creed of the managers. Sworn returns are made to enable the provincial inspector (who is a Protestant) to report what under the law each is entitled to receive; and the returns made are further verified by the personal inspection of the inspector. All the institutions receive both Protestant and Catholic patients, and the rate of aid given to each institution has nothing whatever to do with any matter of creed.

Then come the complaints of some as to the Separate School legislation of ten years ago or more. I have repeatedly discussed the objections to our legislation respecting Separate Schools, in speeches which have been published in pamphlet form and in the public journals. So also have my colleagues; and the Minister of Education may probably say something on the subject to night. I shall only ask you to remember that all our Separate School legislation had for its object to enable the ratepayers supporting Separate Schools, since they are here, to make these schools more efficient, in order that all our people, Catholic as well as Protestant, may receive as good an education as possible. The legislation objected to now or in the "No Popery" campaigns of the past is not recent legislation, but is legislation which took place some years ago. The first and principal Act objected to was passed in 1879; the last Act objected to, I think was not a very important one, and was passed in 1885. All were passed because when being passed they seemed to be fair and reasonable, and such as we all thought would be approved of by the Protestant community of all parties. No one in the House objected to them while they were before the House. Every bill goes through several stages before its final passing; and copies go to every newspaper, and are distributed otherwise throughout the country immediately after the first stage is taken; yet no objection was made by any of the religious journals of the province and none from any other quarter. Not one Protestant church or congregation disapproved. Not one society or one individual, clerical or lay, said an adverse word. The adverse sentiment did not arise until the "No Popery" cry was afterwards adopted in hopes of thereby carrying against us the elections of 1886. Besides all this, let it be remembered that the Conservative leader, Mr. Marter, has publicly announced his abandonment of opposition to Separate Schools, and that the Conservative press generally has approved of this change of policy. Nothing will be gained, therefore, as regards Separate Schools by voting against the Government candidate, and the only object of any talk against them to Protestant electors in the present contest is to get votes.

Every sensitive Protestant may rest assured that we have done nothing for Roman Catholics that fair-minded and earnest Protestants should not have done; that Protestantism is in no danger from the Liberal party or its leaders; and that Protestants will not be harmed one iota by electing Mr. Harty.

Mr. Harty was elected in 1892 as a supporter of the Government. He comes to you now as a member of that Government, and it is by the general

8
record and policy of the Government that he should stand or fall. That is the position he has taken. That is all he asks. Now, what is the record of the Government, apart from the subjects which I have already discussed? Under the system which we happily possess, the Government has two functions to perform. (1) Its members are to see to the legislation from time to time needed or proper; and (2) they have in charge the executive administration of public affairs. What has been the Reform record in these two departments of governmental duty? First, as regards provincial legislation. Has legislative capacity been shown or not by Ontario ministers? Have the laws for which they are responsible been good laws? And have they or not embraced practically the whole field of needed legislation? Our legislation has embraced every subject on which the B. N. A. Act gave to the provinces jurisdiction. There have been twenty-two sessions of a Reform Legislature—one under the premiership of Mr. Blake, and the others under mine—and the laws passed are to be found in twenty-two annual volumes, and in two other volumes in which were consolidated and revised all the public Acts up to 1887. Every annual volume of the twenty-two contains important and well-considered laws in the interest of the people. All were either prepared or revised by experienced legislators or other experts in statutory work. The rule of the Reform Government of the province has been to be always on the alert for new laws or new enactments to promote the well-being of the people. We have not been afraid of novelties, and on the other hand we have not been, or been even charged with being, revolutionists in our legislation; our most radical legislation has at the present day the approval of the whole country; any laws which were attacked while passing through the House have as a rule been recognized subsequently as good and proper laws. Let me specify a few of the subjects which we have dealt with successfully. The vast improvements made in our Election law are absolutely indisputable. It is the Reform Government and party in Ontario which first provided distinct voters' lists; and the immense superiority of the provisions of Ontario on the subject over those of (for example) the Dominion is admitted by all parties. Again, it was the Reform Government and party which, amongst other improvements, introduced the ballot, adopting in Ontario as our model the Imperial Ballot Act, which had been passed shortly before, and which is still the approved law of the United Kingdom, accepted by all parties there with satisfaction. We enlarged the electorate from time to time as public opinion was prepared for the enlargement, and at length the Act we now have was passed, providing for Manhood Suffrage for the elections to the Legislative Assembly, and limiting every elector to one vote. Other important Acts have also been passed at the instance of the Government for improving in various ways the laws of property, and for simplifying and cheapening and rendering more efficient the administration of justice. Other important Government measures have been passed for the special benefit in various ways of farmers; others for the special benefit in various ways of mechanics and other wage-earners and employees. In a word, I claim that the Legislature of the last twenty-two years has introduced important improvements in every branch of law which belongs to provincial jurisdiction; has given valuable legislation to every class of the community; and has dealt beneficially with every public interest. I am not claiming the credit personally for this legislation. Much of it was devised by my colleagues, and some of it by our Reform supporters. So much for legislation.

Then how has it been with our administration of public affairs? Have we shown ourselves equal to the duties of our position? We have never yet been charged with either want of capacity or want of attention to these. Among the most important matters which we have had to deal with has been the maintenance of the territorial and constitutional rights of the province. One half of the province was in jeopardy in the early years after Confederation, and the right of the province was at length secured and placed beyond future controversy through our efforts. The constitutional rights of the province in various matters have from time to time been attacked, and we have been sustained in every case which has hitherto come before Her Majesty's Privy Council. Other constitutional questions are now pending, and more will no doubt arise in the future. Some of these may be more or less doubtful; it is necessary to have them decided one way or the other; and some may be decided in favor of the Dominion, and some in favor of the Province. But no one has expressed a doubt that Ontario's interests will not suffer at our hands in any such controversy. No one imagines that its interests would in the past have been safer in the hands of the opposition; or would be safer in the future either with the Opposition, or with the new party which has sprung up recently, the Patrons of Industry.

The matters in respect of which we are attacked are chiefly matters of finance. In regard to such matters and all others we say with confidence that there is no ground for such attack, that no government anywhere has a better record, that the record of (for example) the Conservative Government at Ottawa is immensely inferior. It is said that we have been wasteful of the public means; and the pretended proof of this which is perhaps most dwelt upon is, that in Mr. Sandfield Macdonald's four years of office after Confederation he saved, or left unexpended, between three and four millions of dollars; while under the administrations which followed his there was greater expenditure, and in fact (it is said) the whole aggregate revenue from all sources, and more, had been used. That is an exaggeration; but how has the public revenue been used, so far as it has been used? That is the question. I will tell you why more has been expended than was expended twenty-two years ago. Many grants have since been made for various beneficial public objects not in existence previously, and enlarged appropriations have been made where needed for other objects previously in a measure provided for. These grants have as a rule had the approval of both sides of the House at the time of their being made. All this is kept back when our opponents contrast the expenditure in Mr. Sandfield Macdonald's time and the expenditure since. Of the expenditure since 1871 nearly six millions of dollars have been in aid of railways (\$5,959,084), and not a dollar was paid in railway aid until after 1871. More than another million of our aggregate expenditure (\$1,180,175) was by way of loan to municipalities for drainage purposes, and not a dollar for this purpose is in the expenditure up to 1871. Then again, in our aggregate expenditure there are more than three millions of dollars (\$3,388,777) distributed amongst the municipalities in cash since 1871 in connection with the settlement of the municipal loan fund difficulty; there is not a dollar for any such purpose in the Sandfield Macdonald expenditure. These and many other useful and approved appropriations made after 1871 were entirely new, and form portions of the aggregate expenditure which our opponents contrast for their own purpose with the expenditure in Mr. Macdonald's time. I have said that in other cases our appropriations were necessarily, or in the public interest, larger than those made in the early years after Confederation. Thus the average annual expenditure in the interest of Agriculture and

Arts up to 1871 was less than \$72,000; while in 1893 the expenditure was considerably more than double that amount (or \$169,573). The average annual expenditure of the province for Educational purposes was not much over \$300,000 in Mr. Sandfield Macdonald's time, while in 1893 the expenditure for this great object was more than twice that amount (\$662,520). There had been a gradual increase for agriculture and education in the intervening years. These and other subjects of expenditure were of public interest; and as the money was in hand it was used by the authority of the people's representatives and the approval of the people for promoting important objects. Our opponents often call attention to the increased expenditure on our public institutions, emphasizing the fact that the annual expenditure for their maintenance was under \$200,000 until after 1871, and that it is now about \$800,000. But they keep back the important fact that there are now eleven great institutions in operation instead of the four smaller ones occupied in 1871, and that there are nearly five times as many inmates to maintain now as there were then. Some microscopical objections are made to some of the supplies for these institutions and their officers, and there are exaggerations and misrepresentations in regard to the supplies generally. But notwithstanding all that is unfairly or untruly said about them, the great fact cannot be and is not disputed that the cost to the province per inmate is greatly less than at most institutions elsewhere. I should like to take up and discuss at length every item in our expenditure to which objection is made, for every objection admits of a triumphant answer. I should like to show you that where there has been an increase in the expense of any department of government, there has been a still greater increase in the business of the department—sometimes many times greater—a fact which our opponents always ignore. In a word, an honest reference to all the facts will demonstrate greater economy, considering the amount of work done, than in those first four years after Confederation to which our opponents are fond of alluding. But I have exhausted both my time and my strength.

Rely upon it, electors of Kingston, that to vote for Mr. Harty is in the interest of the province, and is safe for every creed and class of the people. (Cheers.)

